their the other hand, under the old system of appointments, women office-seekers were far harder to get rid of than the men, as they relied on their sex to excuse their persistence, and, if rebuffed, took to crying, and, if this failed, brought up strong reserves of Congressmen. One young miss brought in her train two senators, four or five members of the Lower House, a general or two, and 'perhaps an admiral or commodore,' though what 'perhaps' means here we do not exactly understand. Of course the ability to bring up Congressmen gave the ladies in Washington great advantages over those at a distance, as a woman on the spot counts with a statesman for twenty-five women in the distance.

We are sorry to find that Mr. Fisher does not describe the Treasury Department as that holy and happy training-school for young candidates for the professions which the eminent financier who presides over it would have us believe. Indeed, he says that the arguments of the Secretary of the Treasury "in favor of the old system of post examinations must have been exquisitely funny to all who knew anything of the actual system of appointments prevailing in that department;" and he adds, that when employees, so worthless 'that even their Republicanism could not save them,' were expelled from the Department of the Interior, "it caused no surprise to find them, after a few weeks probation, safely housed under the spacious roofs of the Treasury.

We believe all who have given any attention whatever to the subject have been long aware of this, and are therefore fully competent to appreciate the employment as the somewhat redundant agent of the Secretary on this subject supplied to those who were on the spot.

Mr. Fisher's experience shows clearly what may be done towards reform by the honest enforcement of even a simple law like that already on the statute-book, and throws a good deal of light, too, which may be useful to the new Civil Service Commissioners, on the difficulties which any attempt at reform will have to encounter. The chief of these difficulties are undoubtedly the hostility of the political class, and above all their duplicity. Were their hostility open, it would be easy enough to arouse public opinion to such a degree as to put it down; but they are far too cunning to say they do not desire reform.

They all, from the President down—and we are sorry to have to include him in this category—profess themselves favorable to reform, and even eager for it, and some, such as Mr. Boutwell, more artful still, declare they are carrying out the reform themselves, and only need to be let alone in order to accomplish all that is required; and in a matter which does not come home to the mass of the people, and about which they are necessarily imperfectly informed, it is very difficult to meet tactics of this kind. The President's course is, indeed, a fair illustration of how not to do it. He came into office as a civil-service reformer; he found on the statute-book a law under which the civil service might be reformed, but which the politicians had converted into a dead letter. For two years he made no attempt to have it enforced; nay, he allowed one of his Secretaries, who made an attempt to enforce it, to fall a victim to his zeal and be driven from his place. Under the pressure of the indignation excited by this case, he feebly recommended civil-service reform in his next message, and Congress authorized him to reform by a section stuck on to the Appropriation Bill last March. He has allowed two months to elapse without acting on that authorization, and now appoints his Commission just as the hot weather is beginning, and with the consequent certainty that nothing can be accomplished till October, and October will find us plunging into the excitement of a Presidential campaign, with the smallest possible chance of obtaining any attention for a movement of this kind, which would seriously interfere with the working of the electioneering machinery by the party in power, at a very critical moment. In fact, if it were not for the character and antecedents of some of the gentlemen he has put on the Commission, we should be disposed to accuse him of throwing dust in our eyes. As matters stand, we are willing to wait and see; but we warn the Commission that the political world, while approving of civil-service reform in the abstract, already begins to express strong doubts whether "this particular measure" is just what is needed, or can do any good.

COMMUNISTIc Morality.

There are two things which more than others have contributed to make the recent events in Paris unusually startling and impressive. One is, that a great part of the atrocities and follies which marked the career of the Commune was the work of men who were not criminals in the ordinary sense of the word, and who professed to be animated even in the work of destruction by philanthropic motives; the other is, that plenty of persons laying claim to high moral and religious feeling have been found among the lookers-on to applaud or excuse their doings, simply because they professed to be animated by philanthropic motives.

And it must be remembered, in examining the matter, that the Commune was simply a portion of the general class movement, of which we see the action in other countries in the shape of trades-unionism, and, we might add, of Fenianism. What took place in Paris was simply the unexpected seizure of the government of a great city, largely peopled by timid rich people, by the leaders of the International Association, which two years ago at Geneva declared war against property and inheritance. The sentiment which animated that Association is one, however, by no means confined to France, and it is roughly this: that the ideas about property, marriage, inheritance, justice, and religion, on which the political and social arrangements of the civilized world are based, are inventions of one class, the lettered or idle class, for their own benefit and for the oppression of the working-class; that the world and the ordering of it belong of right to the working-class—meaning by this manual laborers and no others; and that the time has come for them to enter into the exercise of their authority, and that it would be weak and wicked to allow any of the rules of morality taught by the literate classes to prevent the use of any means likely to accomplish this end, as these rules have been contrived simply for the maintenance of a state of things in which the many are sacrificed to the few. These ideas, too, have now come to be held by large numbers, not simply with enthusiasm, but with fanaticism, and fanaticism always contains a strong element of hatred to opponents, and in the present case all persons who enjoy exceptional advantages, either as regards wealth or education, rank among opponents and incur the hatred. There is in fanaticism, also, a strong element of unscrupulousness; indeed, to say of a fanatic that he was scurvy would be a contradiction in terms. He becomes a fanatic in virtue of his deep sense of the magnitude and importance of his "cause," and of the insignificance of all else, and to help the cause, therefore, he uses any weapon that may be within his reach. For this reason wars of religion have always been unusually bloody and cruel, and all wars for ideas, as distinguished from wars in defence of political arrangements, are of the same character as religious wars. The war which the Reds are declaring on society combines two sources of fierceness, in being both a war of ideas and a war of classes, and it is not surprising, therefore, that in Paris it should have been sanguinary and relentless. One of the most striking illustrations of its ferocity was shown in the seizure and execution of the archbishop and the priests. They were taken as hostages and killed, not simply because the Communists hate the church—though this doubtless had much to do with it—but because their opponents hold the clergy to be peculiarly sacred, and to threaten priests with death was therefore, as it seemed, the surest way of shocking the "friends of order," and giving them pain—in other words, of stabbing the old religious society to the heart.

Now, this spirit shows itself in a stronger form among Frenchmen than amongst other men, because their natures are more intense, and because the new doctrine, that society, as at present constituted, is a hideous contrivance for the oppression of the poor, has been longer at work among them. But it is at the bottom of the way in which the English trades-unions enforced their rules at Sheffield, as revealed in the evidence taken before the Government Commission—that is, by killing, maiming, and blowing up with gunpowder those who either disobeyed the rules or interfered with their execution, and it is to be observed that the men who resorted to these instrumentalities were men of good character, as this term is usually understood, just, true, and kindly in all the ordinary relations of life.
So, also, the Fenian risings in England have been characterized by a complete disregard of the received notions of criminality and by stupendous unscrupulousness. The attempt to blow down a prison wall by firing a barrel of gunpowder in a narrow and crowded street in London, had all the marks of the Communist operations in Paris. The Fenian performances were, however, in this and similar cases, simply copies of the trades-union performances, and at the bottom of both lay the idea which directed the deviltry in Paris last month, viz.: That the interests of the society, or of the class which it represented, were immeasurably superior to all other interests with which they came in collision, and that, therefore, there was nothing which it was not lawful to do to promote them, and that, in the choice of means, whatever most vexed the enemy and struck most terror into him was to be preferred.

No intelligent man can deny that the spread of such doctrines among large bodies of men, in the great centres of population and industry, is a very grave matter, but there is another matter connected with it which is perhaps graver still. "Humanitarian," considered as a sect—that is, persons who, all other doctrines and beliefs being laid aside, make the active promotion of the comfort and welfare, moral and physical, of the masses their great spring of action, and who do this without any expectation of future rewards, and in entire dissociation from Christianity—are a large and growing body, and they number amongst them a great many writers and speakers who exert a powerful influence on public opinion, and more or less on morals and legislation. They have by their exertions managed to spread through society a distrust of the actual state of things in church and state, which, although in a moderate degree it is the source or condition of all reform, is, like most other things, in excess a positive disease, and which, acting on an animal like man, which lives mainly by habit, produces a sort of dementia. We have it now in excess. There is hardly one of us who is sure of the ground he walks on in any field of human thought or activity. Once upon a time, believing was left to philosopher; now we all doubt, and we doubt nothing so much as what has been long settled. There can, however, be no stronger sense of duty where there is no settled conviction; the sense of duty rests on conviction; and our relations to every human being and every human institution, parents, wives, children, employer and servant, government and church, being thrown open to speculation and question, there are fewer and fewer of us who are capable of cutting on any course with set teeth and an undaunted will. The result is, that any man who believes strongly has chances in the world such as never offered themselves before. Anybody who undertook to preach strange doctrines in times past, if a fanatic, found himself faced by fanatics as fierce as he; but the fanatic in our time finds himself in the midst of a timid crowd, who examine him with opera-glasses, and who, if he will only not come after, are willing to concede any postulates he asks for.

It is out of this confusion that the "Red" church has not unnaturally grown up, but what is worst is that it finds admirers and apologists among those who are not of it, but whom its humanitarian tendencies dazzle or propitiate; and there could be no stronger illustration of the size of the breaches made in the received morality than the sympathy which the Communists have found among philosophers, philanthropists, and even preachers. Matters have gone so far that the testimony of the worst ruffian who squats with a rifle behind a barricade, as to the nature of his motives in killing people or burning houses, is taken by many respectable men as a complete refutation of the presupposition raised against him by the ordinary canons of morality. Usually, if you see a man committing a breach of the moral law, you require weighty outside proof either of his insanity, or of his devotion to some idea, to induce you to excuse him; but we have now got to such a pass that we take his simple word for it. We come upon a party of workmen preparing to roast a family in their dwelling-house, and are duly stinched with priO. But face horror, and ask what they are about. They reply that humanity requires this atrocity at their hands. On hearing this, far from going to the rescue or bringing the police, we hasten to the nearest half, call a meeting, give a thrilling account of what we have seen, pronounce the band "erring but noble," and declare that, though condemning their methods, their aims are too lofty to permit of our casting the first stone against them. Now, if there be one deductions from human experience more firmly established than another, it is that the doctrine that the end justifies the means is a detestable doctrine, and as detestable in the hands of the democrat as of the priest or king. There is another hardly less valuable or well settled, and that is, that nothing saves the world from anarchy but the custom of judging men by their conduct, and not by their professions. Acts are the tests and signs of principles, and nothing but acts. If the relations of the working-classes to the rest of the community are to be rearranged and improved, as we firmly believe they may and will be, it must be by steady travelling along the ancient human way which experience lights, and on which opinions are changed by persuasion, and not by threat-cutting, and on which the great advances are made by reason and patience and labor. The world is not going to be set rights in a year for the benefit of the workingman, any more than for the aristocrat; and the broadest "humanitarian" will find in the long run, to his cost, that he will have to live by the Ten Commandments, if he means to have any comfort in this life.

ENGLAND.—MR. MILL ON THE LAND QUESTION.

PARLIAMENTARY business is at the present moment progressing slowly, and the prospect for the session is less promising than ever. The radical theory, as expounded in the Daily News, is to this effect: The Army Bill and the Ballot Bill are the two main Government measures. The Army Bill goes first, and the Ballot Bill can only follow in proportion as the track is cleared. Now, says the Daily News, the Conservatives have made up their minds to accept the Army Bill, not as in itself desirable, but as offering higher terms to the persons enjoying vested interests than they are likely to obtain at any future time. They talk against it, therefore, not in the hope of securing its rejection, or even its modification, but in the view of delaying the Ballot Bill. Put the Ballot Bill first, it is said, and the Army Bill will follow easily enough; but otherwise it runs a fair chance of being squeezed out by the policy of talking against time on the companion measure. I think that this theory is a little too refined; there is this much of truth in it, however, that the Army Bill is producing some of the most wearisome and intricate debates that have recently occurred. At every stage of the measure, we have a repetition from the Conservatives of all the old arguments that have been worn so threadbare. The reason of this, however, appears to be simple enough. The tide of enthusiasm which carried Mr. Gladstone into power is ebbing with so much rapidity, that an obstructive policy, which would have been an exceedingly dangerous game, as against a popular minister, has fair chances of success. The Government majority is, in fact, declining rapidly, and last night they had so much trouble in defeating some proposed amendments that a modification of the bill seems to be highly probable. The bill must be passed through in some shape or other; but it seems as if it might be seriously mutilated in the process. There are, indeed, rumors to be heard, which I mention not as credible, but as significant of the disorganized condition of the Liberal party. It is said that the House of Lords will summon up courage to throw out the bill, and that thereupon some kind of coalition ministry will be formed, with, perhaps, Lord Derby at its head. I think that it would be impossible to form any such ministry which could hold together for a fortnight; but the existence of rumors of this character shows how feasible is the hold by which Mr. Gladstone at present maintains himself in office. The majority is true and pledged to vote for him; but the enthusiasm which is necessary even to work a majority successfully seems to have completely evaporated.

I turn, however, from these speculations to notice an agitation which has been recently started, and which may gain importance at some future period. A league has been formed for the purpose of advocating a reform in the land laws; it has held an initial meeting, and Mr. Mill has addressed it in a speech which has given rise to a considerable amount of controversy. The question is, in fact, one of the most vital importance, and the agitation, if once fairly launched, may lead to a very serious struggle. It is generally stated that the land of England is in possession of 30,000 proprietors, and that the number has rapidly diminished and is still diminishing. The figures, which are taken, I believe, from the last census, are probably inaccurate, and for reasons into which I need not enter; but the general tendency of things is indisputable. That landed estates tend to increase and the number of landowners to diminish, is ob-